



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,202	08/17/2001	Boris S. Elman	00-8024	4924
25537 7590 10/18/2007 VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 500 ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909			EXAMINER ANWAH, OLISA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/18/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/932,202	ELMAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Olisa Anwah	2614	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15,17 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14,16,18-24 and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2614

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, 18-23 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable Qua et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,222,909, U.S. Patent No. 6,222,909 (hereinafter Qua).

Regarding claim 1, Qua discloses an apparatus for transmitting, receiving and recording two-way conversation data between at least two remote locations, comprising:

a wireless communication device;

a memory coupled to the wireless communication device for storing two-way conversation data in digital form;

a device interface for communicatively coupling the wireless communication device to a remote device and sending the stored two-way conversation data to the remote storage device;

Art Unit: 2614

a user interface configured to allow a user of the wireless communication device to access by way of a wireless network, the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device, the user interface including a plurality of data management functions that allows the user of the wireless communication device to manage, by way of the wireless network, the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device (see Figures 1-6).

Again on the issue of claim 1, Qua does not explicitly say that the plurality of data management functions includes functions for editing and translating the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device. "Official Notice" is taken that this limitation is both old and well known in the art. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Qua wherein the plurality of data management functions includes functions for editing and translating the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by allowing the user to perform other intermediate processing/distribution functions as suggested by Qua (see column 6).

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 2, see Figure 1 of Qua.

Regarding claim 4, see column 3 of Qua.

Regarding claim 5, see column 7 of Qua.

On the matter of claim 7, although Qua discloses the plurality of data management functions includes functions for playing back, converting and sending the two-way conversation data stored in the storage location (see column 6); Qua fails to teach the plurality of data management functions includes functions for searching, linking, downloading, editing, archiving and deleting the two-way conversation data stored in the storage location. "Official Notice" is taken that this limitation is both old and well known in the art. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Qua wherein the plurality of data management functions includes functions for searching, linking, downloading, editing, archiving and deleting the two-way conversation data stored in the storage location. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by allowing the user to perform other intermediate processing/distribution functions as suggested by Qua (see column 6).

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 8, Qua discloses a system for managing two-way conversation data occurring between at least two remote locations a network, comprising:

- a wireless communication device;

- a memory coupled to the wireless communication device for storing two-way conversation data in digital format;

- a storage location outside the memory;

- an interface between the memory and the storage location for transferring the two-way conversation data from the memory to the storage location; and

- a user interface that allows a user of the wireless communication device to access, by way of a wireless network, the two-way conversation data in the storage location, the user interface including a plurality of data management functions that allows the user of the wireless communication device to manage, by way of the wireless network, the two-way conversation data stored in the storage location (see Figures 1-6).

Again on the issue of claim 8, Qua does not explicitly say that the plurality of data management functions includes functions for editing and translating the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device. "Official Notice" is taken that this limitation is both old and well known in the

Art Unit: 2614

art. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Qua wherein the plurality of data management functions includes functions for editing and translating the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by allowing the user to perform other intermediate processing/distribution functions as suggested by Qua (see column 6).

Regarding claim 9, see column 7 of Qua.

Regarding claim 11, see column 7 of Qua.

Regarding claim 12, see column 7 of Qua.

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7.

Regarding claim 18, see column 5 of Qua.

Regarding claim 19, Qua does not teach the translating function is conducted by a text translation service that converts at least a portion of the text data from a first language to a second language. "Official Notice" is taken that this limitation is both old and well known in the art. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Qua wherein the translation function

Art Unit: 2614

is conducted by a text translation service that converts at least a portion of the text data from a first language to a second language. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by allowing the user to perform other intermediate processing/distribution functions as suggested by Qua (see column 6).

And for claim 20, although Qua teaches the two-way conversation data is audio data (see abstract); Qua does not teach the translating function is conducted by an audio translation service that translates at least a portion of the audio data from a first language to a second language. "Official Notice" is taken that this limitation is both old and well known in the art. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Qua wherein the translating function is conducted by an audio translation service that translates at least a portion of the audio data from a first language to a second language. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by allowing the user to perform other intermediate processing/distribution functions as suggested by Qua (see column 6).

Regarding claim 21, see Figures 4-6 of Qua.



Art Unit: 2614

Regarding claim 22, Qua discloses a system for managing two-way conversations between a first communication device located at a first location and a second communication device located at a second location remote from said first location, said two-way conversations occurring over a network having at least one storage location, wherein at least one wireless communication device can be connected to said network, comprising:

a data interface between said at least one wireless communication device and said at least one storage location for transferring data derived from said two-way conversations from said at least one storage location to said at least one wireless communication device; and

a user interface, including at least one user-controllable data management function that allows a user of said at least one wireless communication device to access, by way of said network, said data in said at least one storage location, said user interface including a plurality of data management functions that allows the user of said at least one wireless communication device to manage, by way of said network, said data in said at least one storage location (see Figures 1-6).

Art Unit: 2614

Again on the issue of claim 22, Qua does not explicitly say that the plurality of data management functions includes functions for editing and translating the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device. "Official Notice" is taken that this limitation is both old and well known in the art. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Qua wherein the plurality of data management functions includes functions for editing and translating the two-way conversation data stored in the remote storage device. This modification would have improved the system's flexibility by allowing the user to perform other intermediate processing/distribution functions as suggested by Qua (see column 6).

Regarding claim 23, see Figure 1 of Qua.

Claim 26 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 14.

Regarding claim 27, see column 5 of Qua.

Claim 28 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19.

Claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 20.

Regarding claim 30, see Figures 4-6 of Qua.

Art Unit: 2614

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3, 10 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qua in view of Whitfield, U.S. Patent No. 5,995,824 (hereinafter Whitfield).

Regarding claim 3, Qua does not disclose the memory is an on-board memory. Nevertheless, Whitfield covers this feature (see Figure 2). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Qua with the on-board memory shown by Whitfield. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by coupling the memory to the wireless communication by using various techniques as suggested by Qua (see column 7).

Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3.

Art Unit: 2614

And for claim 24, Qua does not clearly show the computer system is divided into multiple user storage locations such that one of said user storage locations corresponds with an individual user. Nonetheless, Qua teaches this limitation (see Figure 3). As a result, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Qua wherein the computer system is divided into multiple user storage locations such that one of said user storage locations corresponds with an individual user as taught by Whitfield. This modification would have improved the system's profitability by allowing network operators to charge a fee as suggested by Whitfield (see column 3).

5. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qua in view of Liukkonen et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,230,214 (hereinafter Liukkonen).

Regarding claim 6, Qua does not disclose the secondary device interface is a wireless interface that allows data transfer between the memory and the secondary device. All the same, Liukkonen teaches this feature (see abstract). And so, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Qua wherein the secondary device interface is a wireless interface that allows

Art Unit: 2614

data transfer between the memory and the secondary device as shown by Liukkonen. This modification would have improved the system's efficiency by reducing costs as suggested by Liukkonen (see column 1).

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qua in view of Wendelrup, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0023099 (hereinafter Wendelrup).

And for claim 16, although Qua teaches the two-way conversation data is audio (see abstract), Qua does forgets to mention the interface is configured to download at least a portion of the audio from the storage location to the memory. Even so, Wendelrup discloses interface is configured to download at least a portion of the audio from the storage location to the memory (see paragraph 0015). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Qua wherein the interface is configured to download at least a portion of the audio from the storage location to the memory as taught by Wendelrup. This modification would have improved the system's convenience by allowing the user to have access to an increased storage capacity as suggested by Wendelrup (see paragraph 0010).

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olisa Anwah whose telephone number is 571-272-7533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8.30 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2600.

OA

Olisa Anwah  
Patent Examiner  
October 2, 2007

Olisa Anwah